

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of March 23, 2005.

Applicant acknowledges acceptance of the drawings. Inasmuch as no objections have been raised regarding the specification, it is thought the same is also acceptable. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 11 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

As Examiner well knows from a careful reading of the disclosure, the present invention overcomes the shortcomings of the prior art by providing a highly mobile spraying unit wherein the movement may be readily and accurately controlled to enable clear defined spraying patterns. This is facilitated foremost by the location of the spray pattern within the forward view of the operator, by the versatility in selecting the operative nozzles, by the ability to provide clear edging with the spray shield, and by the maneuverability of a zero turn radius drive unit. This is in contrast to the spray units wherein the spray nozzles are behind the operator and accordingly not visible during application. This is evidenced by the Cooney reference that was cited on page 2 of Applicant's disclosure, and has been used as a primary reference in the present Office Action.

As abundantly clear, the Conley reference is solely a rear mounted sprayer. It is not mounted on a front frame on the drive unit. The nozzles are not visible by the operator. Accordingly, it is not understood how the reference could be interpreted in a manner contrary to its clear teaching in rejecting the presented claims.

In paragraph 3, Conley was applied under 35 USC 102 against claims 2-5, 8 and 13. Reconsideration is requested. Claim 2, the independent claim, recites 'frame means frontally connected to said drive unit and

projecting forwardly thereof ...” and “nozzle means ... transversely carried on said frame means ... with the outermost being within the forward lateral vision of the operator”. Obviously, these recitations are not met by the reference and the anticipation rejection requirements are not satisfied. Examiner has correctly identified the spray arm as element 50, and the nozzles as elements 54. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, these elements are not mounted on the front frame means. Rather they are mounted behind the drive unit as discussed in the disclosure and with the shortcoming attendant thereto. No nozzles are within the forward lateral vision of the operator. There are no teachings or suggestions to the contrary. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 2 and claims 2 through 13 dependent thereon recite patentable novelty and allowance thereof is respectfully solicited.

With respect to claim 5, the same recites that the spray arms are pivotally connected for movement about a horizontal axis between a horizontal position and a vertical position. As clearly apparent, the Conley arms 58 are pivotally connected about a vertical axis and remain in a horizontal position. Further reconsideration of claim 5 is requested.

Applicant notes that claim 9 was not specifically rejected in paragraph 3, however, the claim was discussed and thus apparently rejected.

Regarding paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC 103. Though omitted from the rejection statement, claim 6 was apparently also included. Claim 11 recites the liquid barrier is removably carried on one side of the frame means and is operative to block spray of liquid media from an adjacent nozzle for direction downwardly at a defined drip edge to prevent application of the liquid media beyond a defined border. Though obviously not shown in Conley, it was deemed obvious to take a non-illustrated component used solely for controlling the

fertilizer distribution from the impeller at the specific orientation of claim 11. There is no teaching or suggestion of such a deployment. Only Applicant's disclosure provides the basis for such unsupported supposition. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Regarding claim 1, the deficiencies of Conley have been discussed above. It does not have spray arms or nozzles mounted on a frame in front of the drive unit; the same are mounted behind the drive unit. The spray arms are not pivotal between a horizontal and vertical position. The arms remain in a horizontal position. Further, Conley does not teach or suggest the specifically claimed spray barrier also as discussed above. Applicant submits that a careful reading of the claim language and the deficiencies of the cited art will indicate the patentable novelty of claim 1, and allowance thereof is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 through 13 recite patentable novelty over the cited prior art and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Dated: June 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

MILLS LAW FIRM, PLLC



Peter D. Sachtjen, Reg. No. 24,619

Mills Law Firm, PLLC
Post Office Box 1245
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 462-3036
Facsimile: (919) 462-3041
Attorney Direct Line: (252) 413-0475